



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,792	01/14/2002	Kevin S. Barker	RSW920010048US1	5596

7590 02/10/2005
Gerald R. Woods
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/047,792	Applicant(s) BARKER ET AL.	
	Examiner Tuan A Vu	Art Unit 2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received:
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20020702, 20040917.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed January 14, 2002.

Claims 1-32 have been submitted for examination.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to because some references to Attorney Docket number cited in page 1 are to be updated to proper numerical format identifiers acceptable by the Office. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 19, 21, 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation recited as 'creating an extension file' (cl. 1, li. 10; cl. 10, li. 15; cl. 19, li. 11; cl. 28, li. 9; cl. 29, li. 9; cl. 30, li. 15; cl. 31, li. 11; cl. 32, li. 11) or just 'the extension file' (cl. 3, li. 1; cl. 12, li. 2; cl. 21, li. 2) is not described in the disclosure. There is mention of 'Extension Schema area' in the 'Description of Related Art' section, pg. 2-3; but there is no evidence elsewhere in the specification of such 'extension file'. Hence this absence of description does not convey that the Applicant was in possession of such claimed feature at

Art Unit: 2124

the time the invention was made. Hence, the above limitation will be interpreted as any form of extension environment or entity in the course of this Office Action.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 12, 18, 19, 21, and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims, 1, 3, 9, 10, 12, 18, 19, 21, and 27-32, respectively cite the limitation 'adapted to' (respectively, line 9, 2, 4, 15, 3, 5, 11, 2, 5, 9, 9, 15, 11, 11). This term does not specify the metes and bound of a feature of the invention. This is indefinite in that it does not define whether an action is taken place or not. The interpretation used in the Office Action is that the feature, e.g. extension file, is to perform something.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrizio et al., USPubN: 20030095145 (hereinafter Patrizio), in view of Agnihotri et al., USPN: 6,311,321 (hereinafter Agnihotri).

As per claim 1, Patrizio discloses a method of converting management models to one or more console interfaces, said method comprising:

Art Unit: 2124

receiving a selection window corresponding to one of the graphical user interface panels (e.g. Fig. 1, 2);

identifying one or more console algorithms corresponding to the console selection (e.g. *UML ... diagram* - para 0042, pg. 3; *schema diagram* - para 0071, pg. 8 – Note: parsing the association relationship within a UML hierarchized diagram reads on algorithm to follow);

retrieving a generic management object from a management definition object (e.g. *MOF property sheet* – para 0041, pg. 3 – Note: an instance of MOF format being created to parse hierarchy of properties sheets reads on generic object); and

creating an extension file (Fig. 9A – Note: enlisting area wherein deriving additional sheets --with JAVA class extended functionalities to support a GUI panel-- takes place reads on extension file) adapted to perform the generic management object on the selected graphical user interface panel.

But Patrizio does not expressly disclose that the selected graphical user interface panel is selected console interface; nor does Patrizio teach selection console corresponding to console interfaces. However, the limitation of console interfaces being selected is disclosed via Patrizio's selection of panel components to modify a certain GUI layout (e.g. para 008-0013; 0030). As for the selection console limitation, the selection of cluster type and subdivision thereof in conjunction with the properties of the GUI layout to be changed suggests console selection in relation with layout characteristics. Related to a user 's selection of components geared for some graphical console layout, Agnihotri discloses selection of console (e.g. col. 5, lines 1-18). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the selection by Patrizio so as to be able to select console as taught

Art Unit: 2124

by Agnihotri because each selection of a particular console would lead to a appropriate set of configuration files or extension program components supporting the graphical rendering of such console as suggested by Patrizio and improve the quality of the integration (Agnihotri, col. 5, line 1-50).

As per claim 2, Patrizio discloses that the management definition object includes a common information model managed object format file (e.g. para 0038, 0040, pg. 3

As per claim 3, Patrizio does not disclose that the extension file includes a plug-in file adapted to interface with the selected console interface. However, Patrizio discloses distribution for deployment in a network (see BACKGROUND) and API to support the viewing of class components being parsed (e.g. para 0063), hence the idea of distribution of media and script plug-in, or API in order to support deploying a media, i.e. deploying the MOF sheets as in an extension area/file, or install product received by the recipient user of distribution network is implicitly suggested. Agnihotri discloses plug-in DLL to install and interface with console product being distributed (col. 5, lines 19-50). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide plug-in to support the interface as taught by Agnihotri to the software being delivered by Patrizio so that in the Patrizio's method the console specification packaged in the user's received product would enable the plug-in support as taught by Agnihotri as mentioned above.

As per claim 4, Patrizio discloses that the retrieving further includes:

identifying one or more object classes and one or more object associations that include the object classes (Fig. 9AB); selecting one of the object classes; selecting one of the associations that include the object class, wherein the association includes a simple association

Art Unit: 2124

(Fig 4, 9ab, 11 – Note: selecting a row table plus parsing a diagram to derive propriety sheets with class and interrelations association thereof read on selecting object and associations including simple association);

identifying one or more target classes corresponding to the selected association (Note: the selecting of one class via which the association leads to another class reads on identifying one or more target classes);

locating one or more second associations corresponding to the identified target class; and determining a layout format based on the number of located second associations (para 0051-0060; 0068-0070 – Note: all class component with *GUI* identifiers read on determining a layout).

As per claim 5, Patrizio does not explicitly disclose displaying the target class name in response to determining that there is one second association; and displaying the association role in response to determining that there are more than one second associations. But in view of the panel display for row table selection; and the underlying of Component class leading to more associations as shown in para 0068-0071, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the display of the target class in response to a second association to Patrizio's panel and row selecting method because this would enhance the visibility of object-oriented component items being enlisted under the user viewer utility; and this is a well-known in object-oriented development using model with hierarchized class enlistment or customized building/packaging for distribution/deployment as set forth in claim 3 above.

As per claim 6, Patrizio further discloses retrieving more user interface data from the management definition object; and generating one or more graphical user interfaces using the retrieved user interface data (e.g. Fig. 4; para 0044-0047; 0053-0061).

As per claim 8, Patrizio further discloses creating a tree node displayable on a management console corresponding to the selected console interface (e.g. Fig. 1 – Note: each cluster selected reads on a node of a tree being selected, the console limitation being the GUI interface as addressed in claim 1); creating a popup menu corresponding to the tree node (e.g. Fig. 5-7), wherein the popup menu includes one or more menu selections; and associating a method to each of the menu selections (e.g. Fig. 5-7).

As per claim 9, Patrizio further discloses that the generic management object includes a display panel that displays information regarding a program product, wherein the management definition object is adapted to manage the program product (para 0044-0048 – Note: the main property sheet from one MOF being parsed and thus directing the manner by which GUI components are to be associated for use via the model schema read on management object managing the program product).

As per claim 10, Patrizio discloses an information handling system comprising:
one or more processors; a memory accessible by the processors; a nonvolatile storage area accessible by the processors; and a conversion tool for converting generic management data to specific console interfaces (Fig. 1), the conversion tool including logic:

for receiving a selection window corresponding to one of the GUI panel interfaces (e.g. Fig. 1, 2);

for identifying one or more console algorithms corresponding to the panel interface selection (e.g. *UML ... diagram* - para 0042, pg. 3; *schema diagram* - para 0071, pg. 8);

for receiving a generic management object from a management definition object (*MOF property sheet* – para 0041, pg. 33 – Note: an instance of MOF format being created to parse hierarchy of properties sheets reads on generic object); and

for creating an extension file adapted to perform the generic management object on the selected console interface (Fig. 9A).

But Patrizio does not expressly disclose that the selected graphical user interface panel is selected console interface; nor does Patrizio teach selection console corresponding to console interfaces. These limitations have been addressed in claim 1; and are referred thereto for the corresponding rejection.

As per claims 11-15, these claims correspond to claims 2-6; hence are rejected with the corresponding rejections as set forth therein, respectively.

As per claims 17-18, these claims correspond to claims 8-9; hence are rejected with the corresponding rejections as set forth therein, respectively.

As per claim 19, this is the computer product means-plus-function claim reciting the same limitations corresponding to those of method claim 1; hence is rejected with the corresponding rejection as set forth therein.

As per claims 20-24 and 26-27, these product claims correspond to claims 2-6 and 8-9, respectively; hence are rejected with the corresponding rejections as set forth therein.

As per claim 28, this claim includes the limitations of claim 1 and claim 4; hence is rejected with the combined rejection as set forth in claim 1 and claim 4, correspondingly.

As per claim 30, this claim includes the limitations of claims 10, 13 and 14; hence is rejected with the combined rejection as set forth in those claims, correspondingly.

As per claim 31, this claim corresponds to claim 30 and includes the limitations of claims 10, 13 and 14; hence is rejected with the combined rejection as set forth in those claims, correspondingly.

As per claim 32, this claim includes the limitations of claims 19 and 26; hence is rejected with the combined rejection as set forth in those claims, correspondingly.

9. Claims 7, 16, 25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrizio et al., USPubN: 20030095145 and Agnihotri et al., USPN: 6,311,321; as applied to claims 1, 10, 19 (for claims 7, 16, 25), and further in view of Cramon et al., USPubN: 2002/0103660 (hereinafter Cramon) .

As per claim 7, Patrizio further discloses retrieving user interface data from the management definition object (Fig. 9A-B); but does not disclose converting the user interface data to one or more national languages; storing the converted user interface data in one or more national language files; selecting one of the national languages; retrieving one of the national language files corresponding to the selected national language; and generating one or more graphical user interfaces using the converted user interface data retrieved from the national language file.

The conversion from a model format language, such as metadata like MOF into a definition language enabling code implementation was a known concept in the art of modeling and code development at the time of the invention, e.g. working with MOF, UML and create XML, RTL, C++, Java class extension language format files prior to implementing a deliverable

Art Unit: 2124

program per se. Patrizio has disclosed conversion of model format in one national language and retrieving such files for converting more interface data via the teachings of Fig. 9a-b, and para 0044-0051; however does not mention about national language format. The use of National Language Support (NLS) to enable persisted data format accommodation to different locale-related language format requirement was a known concept in the database and E-commerce media distribution at the time the invention was made. Agnihotri, discloses support of language when a console is selected using a form of plug-in program to enable installation of media (col. 5, lines 36-50) and Patrizio discloses a tool based on SQL invocations (Fig. 10-11) for instantiating a certain console format. Further, Cramon discloses distribution of E-commerce with plug-ins including user support files based on National Language Support documentation and structure (para 0214, 0227, 0381). Hence, based on the above known concepts, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add to the conversion scheme by Patrizio using SQL communications a documentation format using NLS as taught by Cramon because this NLS format files would enhance user usage of the delivered media for instantiating a console or installing a delivered package using plug-ins as suggested by Agnihotri, the support of language according to locale enabling a proper and direct accommodation to various language format requirement as mentioned above and taught by Cramon.

As per claim 16, this claim corresponds to claim 7, hence is rejected with the rationale as set forth therein

As per claim 25, this claim corresponds to claim 7, hence is rejected with the rationale as set forth therein.

Art Unit: 2124

As per claim 29, this claim includes the limitations of claims 1 and 7; hence is rejected with the combined rejection as set forth in claims 1 and 4, correspondingly.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (272) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence – please consult Examiner before using) or 703-872-9306 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VAT
February 4, 2005


KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100